

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. 1, 3-6, 11, 26 and 34 have been amended. Claims 7-10, 12-25, 27 and 32 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-6, 11, 26, 28-31 and 33-35 are presented for examination. The following remarks are in response to the final Office Action, mailed July 10, 2007.

### **Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection**

Claims 1, 3-6, 11, 26 and 28-35 are rejected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 1, 11 and 26 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 11 and 26 and their dependent claims.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 1, 11 and 26 are objected to because of the following informalities:

“the digital certificate” in lines 12, 16-17 should be – the digital certificate of the4 second party--.

Claims 3 and 6 are objected to because of the following informalities:

The method of claim 2 in line 1 should be –The method of claim 1---.

Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities:

“the second party’s certificate” in line 3 should be – certificate of the second party.

Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities:

“the digital certificate” in line 3 should be – the digital certificate of the second party.

Claim 34 is objected to because of the following informalities:

“The system of claim 32” in line 1 should be –The system of clam 11--.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 26 and 34 have been amended. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objection of claim 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 26 and 34.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection**

Claims 1, 3-6, 11, 26, 28-31, and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Cook, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,922,776 (“Cook”) in view of Kaliski Jr., et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,085,320 (“Kaliski”) and further in view of Geer, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,212,634 (“Geer”).

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method comprising:

registering a first party and a second party with a database at a server,  
wherein the first party is registered as a party relying on a digital  
certificate of the second party;

receiving a request to revoke the digital certificate of the second party  
after registering the first party;

authenticating the request in accordance with a pre-defined authenticating  
policy associated with the digital certificate of the second party,  
and generating an authorization certificate by a revoker of digital  
certificates, wherein the authentication certificate is associated  
with the request to ensure the request is authenticated in  
accordance with the pre-defined authentication policy, the  
authentication of the request including verifying a digital signature  
incorporated in the request with a list of the digital certificates  
previously defined as revoker certificates for a website;

sending the authorization certificate to the first party, wherein the first  
party to receive the authorization certificate;

revoking the digital certificate of the second party in accordance with a  
revocation policy; and

initiating communication with the first party to indicate that the digital  
certificate has been revoked, wherein the communication includes  
notifying the first party that the digital certificate of the second  
party has been revoked, wherein the notification is further sent to  
other parties registering with the database as relying on the digital  
certificate of the second party of the second party.

(emphasis added)

Cook discloses a “*scalable system for notification of a change in condition of an electronic certificate is provided*. The system includes a network of servers capable of providing notification of changes in conditions of electronic certificate to an unlimited number of users. The system includes a first server comprising a detection module and a notification module. The system having at least one server capable of actively monitoring and detecting changes in conditions of a certificate. Other CAP servers in the system may and/or may not actively monitor electronic certificates at the same time. That is, these CAP servers may actively monitor conditions of electronic certificates at the same time they play passive roles (e.g., not monitoring the electronic certificates for which they will be notified of changes from another CAP server).” (Abstract).

Kaliski discloses a “protocol for establishing the authenticity of a client to a server an electronic transaction by encrypting a certificate with a key known only to the client and the server . . . The *client generates and sends over a communications channel a message containing at least a part of a certificate encrypted with the server’s public key or a secret session key*.” (Abstract; emphasis added)

Geer discloses a “system for certifying authorizations includes an authorizing computer and an authorized computer interconnected by a computer network . . . The *authorization certificate includes the new public key. The authorizing computer causes the authorization certificate and the new private key to be transmitted to the authorized computer*.” (Abstract; emphasis added)

In contrast, claim 1, as amended, in pertinent part, recites “**authenticating the request in accordance with a pre-defined authenticating policy associated with the digital certificate of the second party**, and **generating an authorization certificate by a revoker of digital certificates**, wherein the **authentication certificate is associated**

**with the request to ensure the request is authenticated in accordance with the pre-defined authentication policy, the authentication of the request including verifying a digital signature incorporated in the request with a list of the digital certificates previously defined as revoker certificates for a website**” (emphasis added). Cook, Kaliski and Geer, neither individually nor when combined in any combination, teach or reasonably suggest at least these features of claim 1.

*Cook’s scalable system for notification of a change in condition of an electronic certificate is provided, Kaliski’s client generating and sending over a communications channel a message containing at least a part of a certificate encrypted with the server’s public key or a secret session key and Geer authorization certificate including the new public key and the authorizing computer causing the authorization certificate and the new private key to be transmitted to the authorized computer is not the same as authenticating the request in accordance with a pre-defined authenticating policy associated with the digital certificate of the second party, and generating an authorization certificate by a revoker of digital certificates, wherein the authentication certificate is associated with the request to ensure the request is authenticated in accordance with the pre-defined authentication policy, the authentication of the request including verifying a digital signature incorporated in the request with a list of the digital certificates previously defined as revoker certificates for a website* as recited by claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claims 11 and 36 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11 and 36 and their dependent claims.

### **Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

### **Invitation for a Telephone Interview**

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

### **Request for an Extension of Time**

Applicant respectfully petitions for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

### **Charge our Deposit Account**

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: October 10, 2008

/Aslam A. Jaffery/

Aslam A. Jaffery

Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030  
(303) 740-1980